

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claim 1 has been amended. Therefore after entry of the foregoing claim amendments, claims 1-7 and 9-18 will be pending and under examination. No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-7, 12-14 and 17-18 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Martin et al. (U.S. 6,741,855) (hereinafter “Martin”) in view of Karn (U.S. 2003/0147095) and further in view of Satoh (EP 0881587). The rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. The following is a comparison between embodiments of the present invention and the cited art.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a judging unit to judge whether a command declaration is included in a mail received by the terminal device; a command interpreting unit to extract and interpret a specific command following the command declaration if the judgment of the judging unit is affirmative; a creating unit to, if the specific command is interpreted as an instruction to create a list of one or more targets, create the list of the one or more targets from the targets stored in memory of the terminal device, the one or more targets being specified by the specific command and including the mail received by the terminal device; and a mail transmitting unit to create and transmit a mail having the created list as a mail main body and addressed to a requestor.

In other words, the terminal device is capable of transmitting a list of one or more targets, which include the mail received by the terminal device, to a requester. That is to say, *the address of the received mail to be included in the list is different from the address of the requestor.*

The Examiner cited Martin as disclosing features described above with respect to independent claim 1. Martin discloses a server that receives a command message included in a mail, interprets the command message included in the mail, performs processing in accordance with a result of the interpretation, and transmits the result to the transmitter. Based on the cited portions indicated by the Examiner, the technology of Martin is merely capable of extracting mail addressed

to the mobile device 106 (i.e., requester) – that is, *received mail whose destination addresses are the same as the address of the mobile device 106 (requester)*.

In other words, the technology of Martin does not create a list of one or more targets including the received mail addressed to the server 104, for example (see Col. 6, lines 4-7, of Martin).

Therefore, Martin does not disclose the features of independent claim 1, described above. Karn and Satoh fail to cure the deficiencies of Martin described above and are not cited as doing such. Therefore, independent claim 1 is submitted to patentably distinguish over the cited art, alone or in combination.

The pending dependent claims inherit the patentability of amended claim 1 and are submitted to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Dependent claims 9, 10, 11 15 and 16 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Karn, and further in view of Satoh (EP 0881587) and either Farnham et al. (U.S. 2003/0158855), Hatakama et al. (U.S. 2002/0147661), Theimer (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,241) or Rouse et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,530). However, the dependent claims inherit the patentability of independent claim 1 and should be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. None of the additionally cited references cures the deficiencies of Martin, described above.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing docket no. 278542014100. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: July 15, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael Stanley/
Michael Stanley

Registration No.: 58,523
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
12531 High Bluff Drive, Suite 100
San Diego, California 92130-2040
(858) 314-7795